Table of Contents

STATE AUTOMATION SYSTEMS STUDY

SITE VISIT: AUGUST 18 - 20, 1993

CONNECTICUT STATE REPORT

AUGUST 24, 1993

FINAL

Prepared for:

Diana Perez, Project Officer
Office of Analysis and Evaluation
Food and Nutrition Service
3101 Park Center Drive
Alexandria, VA 22302

FNS Contract No. 53-3109-2-007

THE ORKAND CORPORATION

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		Page
	STATE PROFILE	1
1.0	**STATE OPERATING ENVIRONMENT**	2
2.0	**FOOD STAMP PROGRAM OPERATIONS**	3
	2.1 Food Stamp Program Participation	3
	2.2 FSP Benefits Issued Versus FSP Administrative Costs	4
	2.3 FSP Administrative Costs	4
	2.4 System Impacts on Program Performance	5
	2.4.1 Staffing	5
	2.4.2 Responsiveness to Regulatory Changes	5
	2.4.3 Combined Official Payment Error Rate	7
	2.4.4 Claims Collection	7
	2.4.5 Certification/Reviews	7
3.0	**OVERVIEW OF THE SYSTEM**	8
	3.1 System Functionality	8
	3.2 Level of Integration/Complexity	14
	3.3 Workstation/Caseworker Ratio	14
	3.4 Current Automation Issues	15
4.0	**SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT AND IMPLEMENTATION**	16
	4.1 Overview of the Previous System	16
	4.2 Justification for the New System	16

Table of Contents

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

4.3 Development and Implementation Activities 17

4.4 Conversion Approach 19

4.5 Project Management 20

4.6 FSP Participation 21

4.7 MIS Participation 21

4.8 Problems Encountered During Development and Implementation 22

5.0 TRANSFERABILITY 22

6.0 SYSTEM OPERATIONS 23

6.1 System Profile 23

6.2 Description of Operating Environment 23

6.2.1 Operating Environment 23

6.2.2 State Operations and Maintenance 25

6.2.3 Telecommunications 25

6.2.4 System Performance 26

6.2.5 System Response 26

6.2.6 System Downtime 26

6.2.7 Current Activities and Future Plans 27

7.0 COST AND COST ALLOCATION 27

7.1 EMS Planning Development Costs and Federal Funding 28

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

7.1.1 EMS System Components 28

7.1.2 EMS Planning Cost Components 28

7.2 EMS Operating Costs 36

7.2.1 Cost Per Case 37

7.2.2 EMS Operational Cost Control Measures and Practices 37

7.3 Connecticut Cost Allocation Methodologies 37

7.3.1 Historical Overview of EMS Development Cost Allocation Methodology 38

7.3.2 EMS Operations Cost Allocation Methodology and Mechanics 39

APPENDICES

A State of Connecticut Exhibits A-1

B Analysis of Managerial User Satisfaction B-1

C Analysis of Operator User Satisfaction C-1

Table of Contents

LIST OF TABLES

Table No.		Page
2.1	Average Monthly Public Assistance Participation	3
2.2	FSP Benefits Issued	4
2.3	FSP Federal Administrative Costs	4
2.4	Official Combined Error Rate	7
2.5	Total Claims Established/Collected	7
3.1	Workstation/Caseworker Ratio	15
7.1	Final EMS Budget	30
7.2	Consultec, Inc. Deliverables	33
7.3	Additional Consultec Funding by DHHS	35
7.4	EMS Operating Costs	37
7.5	Direct Cost Pools	40

APPENDIX A - State of Connecticut Exhibits

Exhibit No.		
A-2.1	Response to Regulatory Changes	A-2
A-6.1	State of Connecticut Hardware Inventory	A-4
A-7.1	EMS APD History	A-5
A-7.2	Cost Allocation Pools	A-6

CONNECTICUT STATE REPORT

Site Visit August 18 - 20, 1993

STATE PROFILE

System Name:	Eligibility Management System
Start Date:	1985
Completion Date:	1990
Contractor:	Consultec, Inc.
Transfer From:	New Mexico
Cost:	
Actual:	$25,446,201
Projected:	$ 7,444,742
FNS Share:	$ 5,015,164
FNS %:	19.7%
Number of Users:	1,681
Basic Architecture:	
Mainframe:	3090/300J
Workstations:	Lee Data IS372 terminals
Telecommunications Network:	75 SNA/SDLC circuits tied to 8 regional multiplexors connected to Hartford via 56 KB circuits
System Profile:	
Programs:	Food Stamp Program, Aid to Families with Dependent Children, Medicaid, State Supplement to SSI, Emergency Assistance to Families

1.0 STATE OPERATING ENVIRONMENT

The Food Stamp Program (FSP) in Connecticut is administered by the Department of Social Services (DSS), which is headed by a commissioner. The operational units within DSS include:

- Planning and Grants Administration
- Administrative Hearings and Appeals
- Rehabilitation Services
- Family Services
- Adult Services
- Elderly Services

In addition, the Program Support and Operations Support Units are administered by the Commissioner. A transitional plan for the integration of these two functions is being developed. Connecticut has recently undergone a massive reorganization of the Department of Social Services and many additional changes are expected within the next few months as options are finalized.

Computer support for the Eligibility Management System (EMS) is provided by the Division of Administration through its Management Information System (MIS) unit. This unit contains the Data Processing, EMS User Group, and Management Planning and Evaluation sections.

Regional offices, at the present time, report directly to the Commissioner of the Department of Social Services. There are 6 regions supervising 14 local offices. Connecticut does not have county-level political entities. No local office serves a caseload of less than 125 individuals.

The level of unemployment in Connecticut has risen steadily since 1988, reaching a ten-year high of 6.9 percent in 1991. Between 1988 and 1991, the unemployment rate had more than doubled.

The annual report, *The Fiscal Survey of States*, published in October 1992, provides the following information as compiled by the National Association of State Budget Officers:

- Connecticut's nominal expenditure growth for Fiscal Year (FY) 1993 was between 0.0 and 4.9 percent, more than the national average of 2.4 percent.

- Connecticut made budget cuts of $12 million by reducing expenditures on a selective basis.

- State government employment levels decreased by 1.98 percent between 1992 and 1993. Levels had decreased by 1.3 percent between 1990 and 1991.

- A decrease in revenue generated by the State sales tax was offset by a $20.5 million increase in fees for State services, resulting in a net revenue increase of $12.7 million.

- The regional outlook is not promising for New England as this region has been hard hit by the recession. The New England region's unemployment rates are among the highest of any region; its population growth is the lowest.

2.0 FOOD STAMP PROGRAM OPERATIONS

Connecticut administers FSP through its local offices utilizing generic eligibility workers (EW) supported by the EMS system. EMS is maintained by the MIS unit of the Division of Administration but is operated by the State Data Center.

2.1 Food Stamp Program Participation

FSP participation, based upon figures supplied by Connecticut, increased by 119.3 percent for households and over 91 percent for individuals between 1988 and 1992 with the largest percentage increases occurring in the 1990-1991 period. Neither Medicaid nor Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC) showed nearly as large of a percentage increase during these periods.

In an internal document titled "Connecticut's Eligibility Management System is in the Forefront of Automated Public Assistance Systems on a Nationwide Basis," Connecticut claims that from October 1989, when EMS was put on-line, through October 1992, the number of food stamp cases rose by 87 percent, AFDC by 42 percent, and Medicaid by 72 percent. Although Medicaid figures appear to have been overstated, both FSP and AFDC figures match closely with those calculated from raw data supplied by the State. Table 2.1, Average Monthly Public Assistance Participation, presents the number of participants in Connecticut's public assistance programs. All data was furnished by the State; 1988 and 1989 figures are estimates and do not include any input for the town of Watertown.

Table 2.1 Average Monthly Public Assistance Participation

PROGRAM	1992	1991	1990	1989	1988
AFDC					
Cases	54,438	50,032	41,770	35,506	35,488
Individuals	153,906	142,088	118,618	102,217	99,366
Foster Care	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
GA					
Cases	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Individuals					
FSP					
Households	85,253	71,842	52,931	42,538	38,864
Individuals	200,879	174,511	133,297	110,599	104,933
Medicaid	254,739	231,504	200,230	182,943	177,858

2.2 FSP Benefits Issued Versus FSP Administrative Costs

The ratio of benefits issued to FSP administrative costs has increased from 7.1:1 in 1988 to 9:2 in 1992.

Connecticut's average monthly benefit issuance per household over the last five years, as provided in Table 2.2, has increased since 1989.[1]

Table 2.2 FSP Benefits Issued

	1992	1991	1990	1989	1988
Average Monthly Benefit Per Household	$128.03	$119.47	$115.00	$102.08	$102.85

2.3 FSP Administrative Costs

Connecticut's Food Stamp Program administrative costs for the past five years are provided in Table 2.3.[2] Total cost shows a general upward trend over the period while average cost per household has fluctuated.

Table 2.3 FSP Federal Administrative Costs

	1992	1991	1990	1989	1988
Total FSP Federal Admin. Cost	$14,271,913	$14,659,942	$8,943,758	$8,107,264	$8,821,412
Avg. Federal Admin. Cost Per Household Per Month	$13.90	$17.47	$14.25	$15.76	$18.26

[1] The number of households and benefit amounts are data reported in the FNS *State Activity Reports* each year.

[2] The number of households and FSP Federal administrative costs are data reported in the FNS *State Activity Reports* each year.

2.4 System Impacts on Program Performance

The impact of automated systems upon program performance is limited to those areas where increased efficiency in handling the work flow necessitated by program rules, regulations, and policy may be measured.

Other areas of increased efficiency may, in fact, increase the workload of the line level employee because of the increased information available to them through automated systems.

The following areas were addressed with regard to system impact on program performance:

- Staffing
- Responsiveness to regulatory change
- Combined official payment error rates
- Claims collection
- Certification/reviews

2.4.1 Staffing

Connecticut currently employs 220 full-time intake eligibility workers, 474 full-time on-going eligibility workers, and 101 eligibility supervisors in its 14 local offices. The State indicated that total staffing has decreased since the EMS system became operational, however, no specific figures were provided to show the extent of impact the automated system has had upon staffing levels. During this same period, the average monthly caseload per worker increased, but no increase in case backlog was noted although application processing timeliness has been a problem in the past. EMS has been instrumental in allowing the State to serve the increased caseload levels and provide timely benefits.

Connecticut reports an average monthly number of 3,310 cases pending.

2.4.2 Responsiveness to Regulatory Change

Of the 14 specific Food and Nutrition Service (FNS) regulations selected for review by the project, Connecticut indicated that three were implemented in a timely manner. Of the remaining regulations, four were deemed not applicable by the State, three were noted as causing difficulty in the formulation of technical specifications, two were delayed because of unknown causes, one necessitated technical changes to the Eligibility Management System, and one quoted regulation was unknown to the State. The specific status of each regulation is listed below.

- 1.1 273.9(c)(1)(ii)(F) Not applicable, no GA vendor payments.
- 1.2 273.9(c)(5)(i)(F) Not applicable, no school clothing allowance.

• 1.3	273.8(e)(17)	Difficulty in formulating specifications for technical staff, problems in receiving clarification from FNS regional office. Did not implement on time.
• 1.4	273.9(d)(5)(i)	Difficulty in formulating specifications for technical staff. Did not implement on time.
• 2.1	273.8(e)(5),etc.	Implemented on time.
• 2.2	274.2(b)(2)	Partially implemented on time.
• 2.3	274.2(b)(3)	Change to EMS needed. Did not implement on time.
• 3.1	273.9(c)(1)(ii)	Difficulty in formulating specifications for technical staff, clarification from regional office staff needed. Did not implement on time.
• 3.2	273.9(c)(14)	Change to EMS development specifications necessary; other reasons unknown. Did not implement on time.
• 3.3	273.9)f)(4),etc.	Reported as implemented on time, change to development specifications necessary.
• 3.4	273.10(a)(1)(ii)	State staff unsure about what this regulation pertained to (Initial Month Proration).
• 4.1	274.2(c)(1)	Not applicable, Connecticut is not a direct mail issuance State.
• 4.2	274.6(b)(2)	EMS work request submitted, manual process in place.
• 4.3	274.7(f)	Not an eligibility related issue, Connecticut issues ATPs.

Many of the specific regulations cited were issued during the EMS development and implementation periods.

State staff indicated that Item 2.3 (combined initial allotment under expedited service time frames) was the most problematic of the cited regulations to implement and involved both changes to the automated system and to State policy. Item 1.3 (excludes as resources those exempted by public assistance and Supplemental Security Income (SSI) in mixed households) was also identified as difficult to implement because of the inter-system impact of the regulation.

2.4.3 Combined Official Payment Error Rate

Connecticut's official combined error rate increased from 1988 through 1990 and has decreased thereafter.

Table 2.4 Official Combined Error Rate

	1992	1991	1990	1989	1988
Combined Error Rate	8.12	8.65	10.08	9.42	7.68

2.4.4 Claims Collection

Table 2.5 presents claims collection data indicating the total value of claims established, collected, and the percentage of claims established that were collected. From 1988 to 1990 the dollar value of claim collections decreased, but increased in 1991 and 1992. The dollar value of claims collected as a percentage of total claims established decreased every year during this period.

Table 2.5 Total Claims Established/Collected

	1992	1991	1990	1989	1988
Total Claims Established	$929,673	$572,665	$434,865	$557,984	$665,520
Total Claims Collected	$405,057	$315,139	$243,689	$339,640	$452,970
As a % of Total Claims Established	43.5%	55.0%	56.0%	60.8%	68.1%

2.4.5 Certification/Reviews

Dates given by State staff regarding Family Assistance Management Information System (FAMIS) certification varied depending on which staff were questioned. No documents were available from which to determine the actual date of this review. The FAMIS certification review was conducted sometime in 1990 and the Department of Health and Human Services (DHHS) reportedly approved the system at that time. FNS conducted its post-implementation review in July and August of 1990. The final report was issued

in November 1990. The report included findings that the State did not meet certain regulatory requirements. Follow-up reviews by FNS indicate that EMS does not yet fully comply with two regulations (7 CFR 272.18 and 8 CFR 272.16) but has corrective action plans in place.

3.0 OVERVIEW OF THE SYSTEM

This section provides an overview of EMS functionality, complexity, and level of integration.

3.1 System Functionality

EMS supports the AFDC, Medicaid, Food Stamp, General Assistance (reimbursement only), and other State-level Programs in Connecticut. Enhancements are planned to the system to allow the Transitional Day Care and CONNPACE program areas to be added.

- ***Registration.*** Upon entering a direct service office, the client is met by a receptionist who directs the client to either complete an Assistance Request Form or to provide similar information which is directly entered into EMS in the presence of the client. The specific approach varies by regions within Connecticut.

  Both the form and the screening functions of EMS call for the provision of basic identification data as well as information necessary to determine the client's eligibility for expedited service. This data includes: name, Social Security number (SSN), address, telephone number, date of birth, sex, race, relationship, income, assets, etc. A paper copy of this information, similar to the Assistance Request Form, may be produced by the system upon request of the screener.

  As the basic data is entered into the system, a search is conducted of the public assistance database via a name and Social Security number clearance function. This on-line search is conducted against the statewide database to determine if the applicant is a current or previous client. Participation data is maintained on-line for five years.

  Eligibility for expedited service is automatically determined by the system upon entry of the relevant data.

  If the client was previously known to the system, the existing client ID number is used and existing case record information is updated to reflect current information. If the applicant is not known to the system, a new client ID and case record are established at this time.

If a date for a full eligibility determination interview is necessary, the system will automatically schedule the interview. Worker assignment is made by the worker via the EMS system.

- ***Eligibility Determination.*** Detailed demographic, financial, and third-party liability data is collected via an on-line interactive interview. Help screens are available for the interviewer to use, including policy clarification, code values, and organizational procedures. Collected information is used to determine eligibility for all programs applied for, eliminating redundant data collection across program lines.

  Relevant data entry screens are determined by the system and presented to the interviewer in sequence but may be bypassed if determined not to be applicable to the specific circumstances of the applicant. The EMS system provides on-line data edits for code value and logic errors.

  After data collection, all members of the household are searched against the public assistance database to determine if they are known to the system. Potential matches are displayed to the interviewer who determines if the match is accurate.

  On-line access to the Department of Motor Vehicles (DMV), State Data Exchange (SDX), and Department of Labor (wage and unemployment benefits) is available though a separate sub-menu within the system.

  State staff estimate that approximately 50 percent of all applications are processed interactively with the remainder processed by the EW entering data from a printed application form after the actual interview has been conducted. The process varies primarily by region; local offices within regions are fairly consistent in their approach.

  Eligibility determination is conducted on-line. No background processing is utilized.

  The system determines eligibility for each program applied for. EWs must determine the members of each assistance group within the various programs that may be involved in the eligibility determination process.

  EMS also tracks Medicaid spend-down amounts against medical bills for authorizations.

- ***Benefit Calculation.*** Benefit level calculation is performed by the EMS system at the same time eligibility determination is determined. The system returns the calculated benefit level which the EW reviews and confirms. Supervisory approval of eligibility and/or benefit level is not required by the system. *Post* authorization reviews are conducted by supervisory personnel via selected samples.

- ***Benefit Issuance.*** Connecticut issues food stamp benefits via Authorizations to Participate (ATP) mailed directly to households from a centralized facility. Less than one percent of ATPs are designated for certified mailings or local office pickup.

  Issuance is performed on the third of each month, and daily for expedited and special issuances. State staff note that expedited timeframes are usually met, but that heavy work volumes sometimes prevent timely issuance of expedited benefits. Worker-level delays, such as instances where the worker does not enter information which identifies the case as expedited until after the necessary date, are cited as the primary cause of this problem, not EMS.

  ATPs are printed by EMS at the central State Data Center and transported to the Department's location where they are mailed via an automated stuffing machine operated by Department personnel. EMS has the capacity to enter zip codes and add route numbers at this time. This feature may be added soon by purchase of a commercial software package.

  In-house printing of ATPs via a system-controlled laser printer is scheduled for October 1993.

  Duplicate issuances are controlled via a void and re-issue procedure. Issuance history and archived files are available on-line for the past 13 months with the entire issuance history available from archived files upon demand.

  ATPs are redeemed by financial institutions (banks) located throughout the State.

  The bank reconciliation component of EMS monitors all communication with banks for both ATPs and checks. The system tracks daily cashed checks, ATP activity, errors encountered, and daily summaries by bank. Reports are available which show check cashing patterns by date of issuance, ATP usage, and errors related to the processing of the bank's monthly tapes.

- ***Notices.*** Notices are automatically generated by EMS based upon certain case actions/parameters. These notices include:

  - Key events related to household participation
  - Key events related to household eligibility
  - Warning that a monthly report was not received
  - Denial because of failure to keep appointments
  - Eligibility determination results
  - Benefit reductions
  - Benefit increases
  - Application approval
  - Denial based on eligibility determination
  - Closure based on recertification information

- Missing verifications

Workers may add free form text to the following notices:

- Date and time of interview
- Case disposition
- Adverse action
- Expiration of benefits
- Certification
- Benefit change
- Other notices impacting specific client actions

Notices of mass change actions may not be added to by EWs. Workers may also send narrative letters to clients via EMS.

The system supports integrated notices for all programs. Volume is estimated at approximately 210,000 notices per month. A breakdown by specific program was unavailable at the time of the on-site visit.

- ***Claims System.*** EMS does not yet provide a fully integrated claims tracking and collection system. Pre-EMS claims are currently being processed via the WFLOOK and P.C. FRAUD SYSTEM. The WFLOOK system is a pre-EMS fraud tracking system and the P.C. FRAUD SYSTEM replaced the Automated Overpayment Tracking System. Both systems are used for tracking and collection of non-recoupment eligible overpayments.

  The EMS claims system maintains a record of all outstanding claims since EMS became operational. It allows for the automatic calculation of monthly recoupment amounts and the subtraction of these amounts from recipient's monthly benefit issuances. Both the EW and supervisor must take positive action for the recipient's benefits to be reduced.

  Claims are established by the EW who enters data into the system regarding the cause of overpayment or underpayment and whether fraud is suspected. The EMS system tracks the claim status from establishment to resolution and displays the status on-line, except for those claims referred to the Bureau of Collection Services for closed cases.

- ***Computer Matching.*** EMS maintains interfaces with Beneficiary Data Exchange (BENDEX), SDX, DMV, Department of Revenue Services, Medical Management Information System (MMIS), Child Support Enforcement (CSE), and the Social Security Administration (SSA) in addition to Income and Eligibility Verification System (IEVS) and State bank matching. Matching is performed on a scheduled batch basis - monthly for unemployment compensation benefits, quarterly for State Wage Information Collection Agency (SWICA), and annually for Internal Revenue

Service (IRS) databases. Workers may conduct on-line searches (via a sub-menu) at any time.

Tapes are provided to the CSE system on a scheduled basis. These tapes contain information on newly approved AFDC and Family Medicaid clients and on cases where a child is newly shown to be deprived of parental support/care due to absence. Tapes are provided daily for these categories and weekly and monthly for other categories. Weekly tapes for changes to demographic data regarding AFDC cases are also provided.

Other exchanges of program specific data is also provided for between EMS and other social service programs such as Children and Youth Services, IV-E, Medicaid, Health Services, etc.

Matching is performed against IEVS specific data for any individual whose income is "countable" for the following programs:

- AFDC
- FSP
- Medical Assistance Only (including the Dependent Student Program)
- Refugee Cash Assistance
- State Supplement

Frequency of match is based upon the interface/data source. If a person is already subject to matching because that individual's income is countable for a particular assistance unit in one program, EMS still performs additional matching if the person meets the match requirements for a second assistance unit or if the first assistance unit applies for benefits in an additional aid program.

"Hits" are prioritized for action by EWs. Highest priorities are applied to hits for cases that are currently pending, active, or suspended and which match against the Department of Labor (DOL) files for unemployment, wage for unreported employers, and wage over the tolerance amount. Priority parameters vary by programs. After an alert generated by the priority hit passes a set timeframe, it is added to the number of overdue actions reported to the supervisor. All IEVS discrepancies over 45 days old are reported in this manner.

Hits generate on-line alerts to EWs who must resolve the discrepancies within set timeframes depending upon the prioritization scheme described above. State administrative staff note that on-going (maintenance) workers are overwhelmed by the volume of IEVS alerts. EWs must spend between two and 30 minutes to clear a discrepancy, depending on whether the client is known to the worker. Ten minutes is the average time required to clear a discrepancy.

On-line searches that result in "hits" do not have the outcome of the match recorded. Batch matches must have the outcome noted in the system.

EMS refers some cases of fraud and suspected fraud to the State Police. Cases of suspected fraud are investigated by the Department of Income Maintenance (DIM) Fraud Unit. If active and fraudulent, recoupment proceedings are instituted. If inactive, a referral to the Bureau of Collection Service is initiated. DIM enters client demographic information on the Food Stamp Fraud system as a referral for investigation and possible prosecution.

The Bureau of Collection Service (BCS) is served by an EMS interface as related above. BCS reports information to DIM regarding monies collected from various sources relating to both active and inactive cases.

- ***Alerts.*** EMS automatically generates on-line alerts for the following circumstances:

  - Discrepancies reported through IEVS
  - Interviews scheduled
  - Redeterminations due
  - Pending applications
  - Transferred cases

  EMS has a well-developed Alert module that notifies the EW of almost all due case activities.

  Alerts are ranked in priority by the system. Workers can manually delete some alerts from the system

- ***Monthly Reporting.*** EMS determines which cases are subject to monthly reporting requirements and produces the monthly report forms for mailing. Returned forms are directed to the assigned worker via return address coding. Notices are automatically generated for clients whose forms are late and the system automatically closes cases if the monthly report form is not received in a timely manner.

  The system tracks the status of monthly reporters and provides this information via screen display.

- ***Reports Generation.*** EMS does not provide on-line reports to EWs other than the alerts previously described. EMS does have a comprehensive reporting module that includes management reports for State, Federal, fiscal, and statistical information as well as ad hoc report facilities which include the ability to download selected data subsets to personal computers for detailed analysis.

  EMS provides IEVS management reports by selected timeframe for:

  - Number of completions by disposition code per aid program
  - Number of matches per aid program

- Percentage of matches per aid program per follow-up time period
- Unconfirmed and confirmed savings case counts and amounts per aid program
- Listing of cases due and overdue for follow-up

EMS management reports include data about caseloads and recipients by town and office, application activity (including expedited service and overdues), recertifications, case closures, case maintenance activities, alerts, IEVS matches, quality control samples, etc.

- ***Program Management and Administration.*** Electronic Mail for all levels of staff is available. This feature is used to disseminate policy changes statewide and is operated through the EMS menu. On-line case narrative is available and maintained on a monthly basis.

3.2 Level of Integration/Complexity

EMS is a comprehensively integrated system that serves the Food Stamp, AFDC, Medicaid, State Supplement, Emergency Assistance, Child Care, Refugee Assistance, and other State-level Programs. It maintains claims, collection, alert, and issuance functions as well as comprehensive interfaces to nine Federal and State databases.

The complexity of the EMS system is considerable. EMS consists of approximately 50 physical databases and 1,100 separate programs, and features 288 on-line screens. Approximately 3.5 million lines of program code guide its internal logic.

EMS serves over 200,000 assistance units and 250,000 individual clients each month.

The physical components of EMS include over 1,800 on-line devices. EMS issues approximately 300,000 checks, food stamp ATPs, and medical cards each month. This is in addition to the 210,000 notices and 100,000 worker alerts generated during that period.

The size and complexity of EMS provides Connecticut many advantages in the delivery of public assistance services to its citizens. It also represents a strong challenge to the State's technical staff insofar as the maintenance and enhancement of the system is concerned. Some State staff are concerned that a lack of internal technical resources and an insufficiently segmented eligibility module present sizeable barriers to the integration of additional public assistance programs and make on-going maintenance and error correction more difficult. Regardless of these problems, Connecticut has plans (without set dates) for the addition of the Transitional Day Care and CONNPACE programs.

3.3 Workstation/Caseworker Ratio

Workstation to caseworker ratio is consistent across the State. Original plans called for a ratio of 1:1 for all intake and case maintenance workers with additional terminals

available in interview areas. The figures shown below are taken from Connecticut's

4.0 SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT AND IMPLEMENTATION

This section discusses the development and implementation approaches used in Connecticut during the EMS project.

4.1 Overview of the Previous System

The system in place in Connecticut prior to EMS was known as the Caseload Eligibility Management System (CLEM). This system allowed the direct entry of food stamp information from the various District Offices. Monthly reporting was successfully implemented in early 1984 and CLEM also supported food stamp recoupment and on-line entry of client eligibility information. CLEM was initiated in 1982.

In addition to the CLEM system, Connecticut operated a large number of batch and on-line data processing programs (over 90 separate jobs each containing from 1 to 12 computer programs) which processed data relevant to eligibility management.

The CLEM system, however, did not meet Federal requirements for an integrated eligibility system. It was basically an on-line adaptation of existing batch programs, many of which were poorly documented and used outmoded techniques and methods.

4.2 Justification for the New System

Justification for the EMS system entailed both tangible and intangible measurements:

- Tangible Benefits

  AFDC
  - 45 percent reduction in overall error rate
  - Annual savings of $4,697,465

  FSP
  - 52 percent reduction in overall error rate
  - Annual Savings of $3,826,209

  Medicaid
  - 24 percent reduction in overall error rate
  - Annual Savings of $1,470,073

- Intangible Benefits

  The following intangible benefits were cited by the State personnel as justification for the development of EMS:

  - Error Avoidance - More timely and organized implementation of new policies, increased options and resources for worker training, and installation of on-line edits.

- Medicaid Cost Containment Initiatives - Enhance the ability of the Department to assess program alternatives and to implement those alternatives while maintaining the necessary additional data, and to transmit proper data to the MMIS system.

- State Supplement Programs, Refugees/Energy Assistance - Maintenance of date of entry in the system, automation of tickler systems, development of cross-match capability with the Department of Human Resources.

- Employee Accuracy and Morale - Connecticut expected the EMS system to support EWs in such a way that they could concentrate on aspects of their duties involving judgement and accurate collection of information. Also expected was an increase in worker's morale resulting in more accurate work, less turnover, and less sick time.

In addition to the above potential cost savings, Connecticut claimed that EMS would have a useful life cycle of at least 20 years because of the database design and modularity of the proposed system.

4.3 Development and Implementation Activities

Development and implementation activities, as shown in various internal State documents, consisted of the following:

Date	Activity
1/1/84	Preliminary planning began
11/1/84 - 5/31/85	General system requirements definition
11/1/84 - 5/10/85	APD preparation
2/28/85	Draft APD submittal
4/15/85 - 7/31/85	User computer literary training
3/1/85 - 7/30/85	RFP preparation
5/20/85	APD submittal
6/1/85 - 7/15/86	Preparatory detailed requirements definition
7/30/85	RFP submittal
9/9/85	DHHS approval - APD
10/6/85	FNS approval - APD
10/18/85	FNS approval - RFP
10/28/85	DHHS approval - RFP approval
10/29/85	RFP release
11/19/85	Bidder's conference
1/14/86	Proposals due
1/14/86-2/10/86	Evaluation of proposals
2/14/86	Select contractor - begin negotiations
3/27/86	Negotiated contract submitted for Federal approval
8/7/86	Federal and State approval of contract

8/28/86	Contractor begins work
8/28/86 - 1/28/87	Detailed requirements definition
7/28/87	Detailed system design
12/1/87	Hardware RFP submitted
2/8/88	Hardware RFP approved and released
3/30/88	Hardware bids received
4/20/88	Vendor selected - submitted for Federal approval
5/30/88	Hardware contract approved - installation begins
6/20/88	Training begins
7/1/88	System test started
11/1/88*	Parallel test pilot of EMS is operational
3/31/89	System development completed
5/1/89	Watertown pilot started
5/31/89	System testing completed
8/1/89	Waterbury implemented
10/1/89	Group II offices implemented
11/15/89	Training completed
12/1/89	Group III offices implemented
1/1/90	Warranty period begins
3/1/90	EMS fully implemented statewide
5/31/90	Federal certification review completed
7/31/90	Warranty period ends

* All dates after this point are those planned as of 3/15/89 but were not documented in internal records provided to the Project team.

The planned statewide implementation of EMS was originally scheduled for June 1987.

The selected contractor, Consultec, Inc. received the original EMS development contract in August 1986. This contract was for 18 months and was to result in an operational, statewide system. The original contract was extended for four months. This extension was made in September 1987 and stipulated a change in the development path from VSAM file structures to an IMS database management system approach at no additional cost to the State or Federal government. The decision to use IMS versus VSAM was actually made prior to the contract award and was stressed by both the State and Federal government as a condition of Federal approval of the contract.

In December 1987, the State asked the Federal government for additional funding for EMS development citing the impact of changing from VSAM to IMS (which was then becoming apparent) and the changing Federal regulations that were mandated after the original contract was signed. In addition to this major change, the contractor was awarded several change orders for the incorporation of program areas defined after the award of the original contract.

State staff, in the initial planning for the EMS system, reviewed systems currently operating in, or under development for, the following States:

- New Mexico
- North Dakota
- Alabama
- Alaska
- Arizona
- Mississippi
- Arkansas
- Vermont

Of these systems, only the Vermont and North Dakota systems were viewed as feasible for transfer to Connecticut. Staff indicated that their concerns were directed towards the use of existing technology and that no specific system was targeted during the review period. In particular, the staff was interested in obtaining a system that would operate with the State's existing hardware, had a high degree of application integration and desirable functionality, and would support the Medicaid Program.

Reviews of candidate systems were conducted via on-site visits, telephone contacts, documentation reviews, system demonstrations, discussions with vendors, and discussions and visits with DHHS personnel.

4.4 Conversion Approach

Connecticut's conversion approach was based on the automated conversion of a majority of data elements contained in the previous system. All currently open cases were converted, as were new cases opened during the conversion period and all cases closed during the previous five years. No closed applications were converted.

Training of caseworkers and field staff in the use of EMS was described by administrative staff as inadequate considering the complexity of the system. The training took place over a two week period for all offices due for conversion. Classroom training was utilized as well as self-guided training after the field staff had returned to their offices. Field staff reportedly had "a lot of difficulty in learning to use the automated system". One reason for this problem was reported to be because Health care Financing Administration (HCFA) pushed for implementation of the EMS system before it was technically ready to be used. Problems reported in the EMS system during conversion/implementation included:

- System downtime
- Response times (due to on-line failures)
- Incomplete system

Conversions of regions were accomplished via batch runs over the weekend prior to the implementation of EMS in that area. More than 92 percent of all cases were reportedly converted without significant problems; the remaining cases, however, required caseworker intervention. The State requested, and received, a two month waiver of re-determination time frames during the conversion/implementation effort.

4.5 Project Management

The project structure included the following committees and groups:

- Executive Committee
- Planning Committee
- Working Committees
  - Current Operations Committee
  - Future District Organization Committee
  - Training Committee
  - Technical Committee
  - Reporting Requirements Committee
  - Readiness Committee
  - Applications Committee

The duties of these committees are described below:

- ***Executive Committee*** - The Executive Committee provided overall direction to the project, monitored completion of milestones and major project phases; kept EMS as an important priority of the Department; acted as liaison with the Governor, Office of Policy and Management, and the General Assembly; and reviewed and approved all major decisions of the planning committee.

  Members of this committee included:

  - Commissioner
  - Deputy Commissioner - Programs
  - Deputy Commissioner - Administration
  - Director of Program Policy
  - EMS Project Director
  - Director of Data Processing
  - Director of Field Operations

- ***Planning Committee*** - The Planning Committee monitored all activities related to the completion of project milestones, coordinated agency resources, and assigned tasks to the Working Committees as needed. This committee consisted of the project director, the director of program policy, and key top-level administrative staff of the Department. The EMS consultant was also a member of this group, which had a total membership of 14 individuals.

- ***Working Committees*** - The Working Committees were time-limited, task-*specific* groups that were given the responsibility of developing reports specific to their areas of concern. The EMS project director was an ex-officio member of each

working committee; each of these committees was headed by a member of the Planning Committee. Exact membership of these committees were not specified in internal State documents examined by the project team.

The Planning Committee must be considered as the organizational representation of the EMS project effort. It contained the heads of all major departmental units that would be impacted by the EMS system.

The EMS project director reported organizationally to the director of program policy who reported to the deputy commissioner of programs. The project director had previous experience in the medical services field (three years) and in the Office of Policy and Management but no MIS or project management experience.

The number of dedicated project staff was intentionally kept small to "insure user involvement". Project staff consisted of the project director, an independent systems consultant, a human resource development specialist, and a public assistance program specialist. The position of EMS field liaison was added in February 1987 and the position of EMS assistant project director was added in October 1987. This position was filled by the former human resource and development specialist.

4.6 FSP Participation

Connecticut did not have a separate Food Stamp Program unit at the time the EMS project was organized. FSP participation was limited to the members of the Executive, Planning, and Working Committees who had FSP experience or were responsible for the administrative aspects of the policy and field operations of this program.

User groups were formed as needed (functional work groups); a standing user group, however, did not exist. FSP participation was therefore limited to administrative and executive level staff who had responsibility for the overall progress of the program.

4.7 MIS Participation

MIS participation consisted of three full-time internal MIS employees; others were assigned to the project as required. The MIS technical staff thus could not have representation in every technical work group formed by the contractors. In comparison, the contractor's staff at one time consisted of over 90 technical and administrative staff. In addition, much of the actual development work was conducted off-site in Atlanta, Boston, and Raleigh. Because the development computer was the State's computer system, State employees were able to review and comment on issues before production information. During implementation, the State's MIS computer operations personnel assumed full operation processing responsibility. The State programming staff in addition to Consultec support personnel were on-call for problem resolution.

4.8 Problems Encountered During Development and Implementation

The major problems encountered during the development and implementation of the EMS system were related to the original proposal to utilize a VSAM file structure (rather than the IMS DBMS) and the dynamic nature of Federal program rules and regulations existing at the time of the EMS development. Slippage in time, cost overruns, hurried implementation necessary in response to Federal agency mandates, and under estimations of necessary resources were all factors during this development effort.

State staff indicated that all phases of the project would have benefited from additional time. The areas of design, development, testing, training, and implementation were specifically mentioned. As noted in Section 4.4, Conversion Approach, expedited implementation of the system in response to Federal (HCFA) requests created a situation where the system was moved to operational status before it was finished and before the necessary equipment was available to successfully operate it in a field environment.

Resource and cost estimates based upon other States' experiences, contractor's experience and expertise, and internal estimates did not take into account the changes in technical approach and Federal regulatory changes that took effect during the development period. State staff also noted the contractor's lack of experience in the IMS environment and the lack of internal MIS staff to monitor the technical progress of the development. The State technical staff reported a need to re-write the code and fine-tune the code and database extensively.

5.0 TRANSFERABILITY

The EMS system is a fully-integrated eligibility determination and benefit issuance system that has been chosen as a transfer model by several States since its implementation. It features an interactive interview capability as well as extensive user-oriented features. Its use of the IMS DBMS, COBOL II, and modern utilities makes it attractive to large States with IBM mainframes.

Organizational conditions specific to Connecticut regarding the collection of claims on closed cases have resulted in this feature of the system being somewhat underdeveloped in comparison with other States, however, this should not be a major problem in a transfer environment.

Connecticut appears to be actively supporting inquiries from interested States and vendors about use of EMS as a transfer candidate to other States and has developed overview documentation and descriptions of the features and functions of the system for use by other organizations. Connecticut has transferred EMS to Maryland, Washington, and Michigan. Demonstrations of EMS have been given to many States over the past few years and the staff continue to answer inquiries. The EMS Project Manager is currently managing a large-scale project in a midwestern State that uses EMS as the transfer model.

6.0 SYSTEMS OPERATIONS

The following section provides a description of EMS, including a profile of system hardware and a discussion of the system operating environment.

6.1 System Profile

The components supporting EMS are as follows (a detailed listing is contained in Appendix A, A-6.1):

- **Mainframe:** IBM 3090/300J
  MVS/ESA, CICS, IMS, ACF2
- **Disk:** IBM 3380/3390
  EMC Symmetrix Disk Array
- **Tape:** IBM 3480 Cartridges
  Storage Tek 4670 Reels
- **Printers:** Impact - Northern Telecom BP2000
  Laser - IBM 3800
- **Front Ends:** IBM 3745
- **Workstations:** Lee Data IS372
- **Telecommunications:** 75 - SNA/SDLC 9.6 KB point-to-point circuits connected multiplexors throughout the State and connected to Hartford via 56 KB circuits

6.2 Description of Operating Environment

The operating environment for EMS consists of several components. This section describes these components, including the current operating system environment, maintenance, telecommunications, performance, response time, system downtime, and plans for future hardware and software enhancements.

6.2.1 Operating Environment

The Connecticut Department of Social Services was recently formed by the merger of several departments. The Division of Management Information Systems is part of DSS, reporting to the Deputy Commissioner. The Data Center supporting EMS is one of several State centers under the auspices of the Department of Administrative Services (DAS); however the operating environment is somewhat unique.

MIS has full control of the application, database, and technical support of EMS. Operational control of the batch cycle and the schedule of the on-line region is also under the control of MIS. The Connecticut Administrative Technical Center (CATER) runs the scheduled work for DSS and provides system software support, network communications support, and full technical support for all other State agency applications run at CATER. DSS also has network and technical support staffs; they work in conjunction with the CATER staff to deal with system issues on an ongoing basis. First-level trouble diagnosis is also performed by DSS. A separate facility has been established via channel extension technology that allows DSS to monitor production jobs, control batch workflow, and print to its own printers as if it was Data Center operator.

The CATER center runs 7 days a week, 24 hours a day using two processors: a 3090/600S and a 3090/300J. The 300J was added in June 1993 and supports EMS, Human Resources, Department of Children and Youth Services, and Central Collection. On-line hours are from 7:00 a.m. to 5:20 p.m. Monday through Friday, with special production hours scheduled as needed. Batch systems are processed from 6:00 p.m. through 6:00 a.m. the next morning. Seven CICS regions support production, training, and testing for all applications. The 600S supports all the other State agencies (DMV, Judicial Tax, Comptroller, etc.) and can be used as backup for critical applications if the 300J should be down for an extended period. The systems run under MVS/ESA with the database controlled by IMS.

The systems are supported by IBM 3380 and 3390 direct access storage devices (DASD), Storage Tek 4080 Solid State storage device, and a recently installed EMC Symmetric Disk Array Processor that provides 90 gigabtyes of extremely high-speed, cached storage. The array processor is being used to support page data sets and high access files, such as indices, and has improved performance. Additional usage and testing of other types of files will be done before additional array processors are acquired.

Connecticut converted its reel tape processing to cartridge drives several years ago. It took an aggressive conversion posture and migrated into the new environment with a phased plan of cartridge output and scratch pool conversions to shorten the cycle as much as possible. This allowed the State to eliminate as much tape duplication as possible during the migration. The library currently consists of approximately 50,000 cartridges and several hundred reels retained for archive purposes. Six reel-to-reel drives are used for foreign tape processing.

Printing is supported by an IBM 3800 laser printer and a Storage Tek 5000 impact unit. DSS has two Northern Telecom 2500 LPM impact printers and two Xerox 9790 laser printers in its own building to support EMS output processing. The output queues are controlled by DSS personnel via remote system consoles.

Four IBM 3745 Front End Processors support the telecommunications network, with one spare unit retained for backup purposes. The spare unit is rotated into production each week to allow the unit to be exercised and to ensure that the spare is functional when needed.

A battery-only uninterruptible power supply (UPS) is installed which provides up to 15 minutes of auxiliary power if the main power feed is lost. Plans for a full diesel generator backup are expected to be implemented when CATER moves to a new Data Center within the next 12 to 24 months.

A disaster recovery plan is in place and is exercised twice a year. There was no opportunity to review the written plan.

6.2.2 State Operations and Maintenance

DAS provides both operational and technical support to its users. DSS does not use all of these services since it has some of the same skills on its own MIS staff. For DAS, the following staffing levels are in place: computer operation - 60, systems programmers - 17, network design - 12, network control - 3, help desk - 4, operations support/production control - 6, output distribution - 8, tape library management - 3, and disaster recovery/security - 4.

DSS has a staff of 65: application support - 28, operations - 14, office automation - 9, and database administration - 14. All EMS support, including job scheduling, application level system software and database issues, and 24-hour operations monitoring and production processing are under the control of the DSS MIS group. This type of environment is different from other States visited due to the extent of DSS control over the production environment managed by another department. DSS feels that the current staffing levels for application support are insufficient for them to reasonably support EMS, its enhancements, and changes. They are able to keep ahead of the demand, but the backlog of 1,500 service requests is a strong indicator that additional staff is needed. Although the State feels it is competitive with industry in retaining qualified systems professionals, it is unable to increase permanent staffing. Seven contract programmers are currently on board to augment the State staff.

Hardware maintenance is performed on Sunday morning from 3:00 a.m. until the start of first shift. Software maintenance is performed at the same time or on Wednesday mornings from 6:00 to 7:00 for shorter, controlled changes. Application files are backed up twice each night - once before the batch cycle and once after the cycle is completed. CATER provides backup processing for all files every weekend, but does not perform any weekday incremental processing.

6.2.3 Telecommunications

The telecommunications network supporting EMS is a SNA/SDLC configuration consisting of ten Codex 6740 multiplexors, eight in district offices and two in the CATER Data Center. From these multiplexors, 46 9.6 and 19.2 KB circuits connect each of the local offices to the multiplexor, most being point-to-point circuits. The multiplexors are connected to the CATER multiplexors via 56 KB circuits, and then into the mainframe through the 3745 FEPs. The DSS facility is connected to the CATER via a T1 circuit to

support the printing volume and high level of programming and central office transaction levels.

Additional networks are in place to support other agencies being processed on the IBM mainframes or on one of the two non-IBM platforms (DEC and Prime). The IBM networks are expected to be combined into a statewide backbone network sometime in the next 2 to 3 years, while the Prime and DEC applications will, ultimately, be combined into the IBM processing platform.

6.2.4 System Performance

The CATER center was a single IBM processor installation (3090/600S) until two months ago. Due to processing bottlenecks on the processor and continuing workload growth in all applications, the 3090/300J was acquired and the EMS workload moved onto the 300J. Utilization and performance for EMS noticeably improved. Current measurements indicate that the EMS application uses approximately 16 percent of the processing resources being used on the system. The system currently averages 46 percent utilization (EMS represents 35 percent) of the processor. Peak utilization for a shift reaches 58 percent, allowing more than enough room for application growth. The 600S, without EMS, is still running fairly high peak utilization of 85 percent, but the average utilization has dropped to 48 percent.

Implementation of the EMC disk array processor has improved the processing performance of the selected files moved there. It is expected that if the initial success of the device continues, more use will be made of this new technology. At the present time, EMS has an adequate allocation of DASD space and will acquire additional resources as the client database grows. There are no foreseeable bottlenecks for EMS in the disk area.

Daily transaction volumes for EMS average 424,000, but no data was available to determine how many of those were FSP.

6.2.5 System Response

Connecticut is one of the few States visited that tracks point-to-point terminal response time. Over the past year, EMS has had an average response time, for all transactions, of 3.1 seconds. The average response time in the first half of calendar 1993 was increasing until the 300J was installed. The response time average for May, 1993 was 3.7 seconds and for June, 1993 2.6 seconds. The ability to remove processing constraints by the addition of the second processor had obvious benefits, but even the pre-split response times were very acceptable.

6.2.6 System Downtime

The system availability percentage for June, 1993 was 99.8 percent. The 12 month average for EMS through June, 1993 was 97.9 percent. CATER has a performance objective of 99.5 percent for the system and has had problems meeting that objective.

The new processor may help alleviate whatever caused the higher level of outages, but more time will be necessary until any trends can be evaluated. From the DSS perspective, reliability of the CATER operation has not been a problem. If two months (July and August 1992) are removed from the calculation, availability improves to 98.7 percent since these two months represent 48 percent of the total outages for the year.

6.2.7 Current Activities and Future Plans

Plans are in place to make the following hardware/software changes:

- CATER plans to move into a new Data Center facility in 1995, providing much more space for equipment. Several existing State Data Center facilities will be merged into the new CATER environment.

- A statewide backbone network will be undertaken in 1994, combining some of the existing stand-alone networks.

- Implementation of systems-managed storage has been underway for nearly two years and CATER will continue to move toward full implementation. The project does not have a high priority and will take a undetermined time to complete.

- Tape silo technology has been reviewed and is expected to become part of the

Additional sources include notes and worksheets maintained during the development phase. Specific references to these sources are presented in footnotes, as appropriate.

7.1 EMS Development Costs and Federal Funding

The total development costs for EMS incurred through the end of the FFY 1992 were $25,446,201. The FNS share was $5,015,164; total Federal Financial Participation (FFP) was $3,566,048.[3] The development contractor was originally scheduled to begin work in March 1986, but actually began in August 1986. Statewide implementation, originally scheduled to be completed in June 1987, was rescheduled to June 1988 based on the start of the work by the development contractor. Statewide implementation occurred in January 1990.

EMS was conceived in 1983 as an alternative to a major upgrade to the CLEM system and the other software programs that were then supporting the Federal programs administered by the Department of Income Maintenance. The initial APD was submitted to FNS in April 1985 with an estimated budget of $7,444,742. The FNS share, $1,459,911, was allocated at 19.61 percent. FNS funding was approved for $1,052,684. Of this amount, $968,169 was approved for 75 percent FFP funding; $84,515 was approved for 50 percent FFP funding. The statewide EMS implementation date proposed in the April 1985 APD was June 1987. FNS approved the APD in October 1985; the approved share was $1,290,892 based on an approved cost of $6,582,826. The approved FFP was $968,169.

The April 1985 APD underwent nine revisions through April 1990. Appendix A, Exhibit A-7.1, EMS APD History, presents an overview of each revision including its total budget, key milestone dates, and the subsequent approval granted by FNS to the revision, if applicable. The exhibit shows that revision eight requested Federal approval for EMS at $26,065,218. The FNS share of this final cost was $5,111,389. FNS approved this amount and share on April 20, 1990.

The exhibit also addresses the $10,353,248 ceiling placed on the Consultec, Inc. development contract by FNS. The $10.35 million was budgeted for Consultec in APD revision six, submitted to FNS in March 1988. Revision seven, however, increased this amount to $11,053,043; the budget for Consultec remained at this level for revisions eight and nine. By approving APD revision eight with a total budget of $26,065,218, which contained a Consultec line item for the $11 million, FNS essentially removed the contract ceiling and agreed to reimburse the State for total costs of the development contractor.

7.1.1 EMS System Components

The EMS supports the following programs:

[3] FNS EMS Development Costs Claimed, Revised 8/18/93, spreadsheet provided by Connecticut.

- Medical Assistance, including Title XIX, State-funded Medical Aging
- AFDC
- Food Stamp
- Refugee Assistance
- Energy Assistance
- Emergency Assistance for Families

EMS is designed to support all programs administered by the Connecticut Department of Income Maintenance.

7.1.2 EMS Cost Components

The final EMS budget submitted to and approved by the Federal funding agencies is presented in Table 7.1. This budget was submitted in November 1989, two months prior to statewide implementation, and accurately reflects the component costs. The table shows that State personnel costs accounted for almost 17 percent of the total costs; more than 47 percent of the total costs were incurred for contractor support, and of that, more than 43 percent was for the development contractor. The table shows that development hardware accounted for less than one percent of the total cost. However, it also shows that operational costs billed to the project by the State Data Center accounted for almost one-fourth of the total budget.

Table 7.1 Final EMS Budget

EMS COMPONENT	EMS COMPONENT COST	% OF TOTAL COST
PERSONAL SERVICES	**$4,368,443**	**16.76%**
EMS Staff & Fringes	$919,295	3.53%
Policy Rewrite & Fringes	$531,847	2.04%
Data Processing & Fringes	$2,402,121	9.22%
Admin Overhead & Fringes	$515,180	1.98%
CONTRACTORS	**$12,333,268**	**47.32%**
User Representative	$88,203	0.34%
Project Consultant	$523,000	2.01%
Data Base Consultant	$117,000	0.45%
Technical Assistance	$31,001	0.12%
Consultec, Inc.	$11,353,043	43.56%
Training Developer	$130,139	0.50%
Contingent Support	$90,882	0.35%
DATA CENTER	**$8,451,914**	**32.43%**
Software, maintenance, supply	$156,002	0.60%
Development Facility	$92,251	0.35%
Operations Charges	$6,329,990	24.29%
Hardware Rent/Maintenance	$249,950	0.96%
Hardware Installation	$3,819	0.01%
Telephone Line Charges	$119,902	0.46%
Electrical Renovations	$1,500,000	5.75%
Miscellaneous Charges	$528,695	2.03%
Indirect	$382,898	1.47%
TOTAL DEVELOPMENT (per 11/1/89 budget)	**$26,065,218**	**100%**

The following sections address each of the major components of EMS development.

7.1.2.1 Hardware

Three types of hardware were acquired to support EMS. Each of these is described below:

- ***Development Hardware.*** Connecticut was contractually obligated to provide and equip a development facility to be used by the development contractor for EMS development. The facility was to be sufficient to support a staff of 40 people and include 16 terminals and peripheral equipment, communications links, and appropriate office equipment and fixtures. The computer equipment was leased.

  For the original 18-month development period, this facility was budgeted at $42,413. By 1988, this estimate was increased to $62,250; an additional $166,950 was budgeted for hardware rental and maintenance. In the final budget for EMS, the facility budget was increased to $72,101; hardware rental and maintenance increased to $195,355. These increases were directly tied to the 12-month project delay.

  Remote development locations were supported in Boston, Massachusetts, Raleigh, North Carolina, and Atlanta, Georgia. The primary costs associated with these sites were telephone line charges which were budgeted at over $1.1 million in the final budget.

- ***District Office/Central Office Hardware.*** The hardware purchased for these offices cost more than $2.3 million.[4] The original plan included the purchase of 1291 terminals, 91 desktop printers, 113 table top printers, 63 controllers, and a number of modems. Additional hardware has been purchased since implementation. These hardware items have been purchased using a Department of Administrative Services master contract. The cost of this hardware was not included in the EMS development costs; it is instead being charged as part of EMS operations, based on a 5-year depreciation schedule.

- ***CPU and Data Center User Fees.*** The original plan for upgrading CPU capacity at the State Data Center was to install two IBM 3090-200E processors during the EMS development phase. In 1987, one of these processors was installed; in early 1989, it was upgraded to an IBM 3090-600 model. In May 1993 the second processor was installed. The costs of these processors was charged to the EMS project as part of the operations costs accumulated during development activities and billed to EMS by the Center.

  The estimated costs for the original 18-month development phase, $800,000, was budgeted as a Data Center cost item for *TSO Services*. In March 1988 these costs were budgeted as *User Charges* and totalled $1.33 million. By March 1989, the

[4] Cost figure provided by contracts personnel.

budget for these operations charges was increased to $7.4 million and included charges for telecommunications, batch and on-line services, time sharing services, storage, and print services. The increase was attributed to five factors:[5]

- Rate increase by the State Data Center to reflect additional processor costs
- Increased software development and testing periods[6]
- An increase in the number of Consultec personnel assigned to EMS software coding and testing[7]
- Extensive recoding and retesting demands required for error correction
- Addition of a second processing region to use during acceptance testing.

7.1.2.2 Consultec, Inc.

As of February 1990, Consultec, Inc. billings totalled $10,353,048 for EMS development. An additional $3,532,115 has been billed for system change orders through July 1993.[8] The contract history of Consultec, Inc. is detailed below.

- ***Development Contract.*** Consultec, Inc. was awarded an $8,496,582 contract on August 13, 1986 to design, develop, install, and implement EMS. All change orders were to be billed at $50 per hour. The period of performance was 18 months and required delivery of nine products. These products and their cost as of February 1990 are listed in Table 7.2, Consultec, Inc. Deliverables.

[5] APD, 3/15/89.

[6] Development and testing activities originally scheduled to end in July 1988 were extended to May 1989.

[7] Consultec originally bid a staff of approximately 40 people; this number increased to 90 during critical points in the development phase.

[8] Cost figure provided by contracts personnel.

Table 7.2 Consultec, Inc. Deliverables

PRODUCT	CONTRACT COST
Detailed Requirements Definition	$2,030,027
Detailed System Design	$1,929,549
System Development	3,105,444
System Test	369,281
Training	148,798
Phase Implementation	411,908
Statewide Implementation	200,749
Federal Certification	17,968
System Warranty	282,858
Total	**8,496,582.00**

The Consultec, Inc. contract was increased by a contractor-requested period of four months for over $1.8 million. Connecticut also reimbursed Consultec for change orders to add functionality to EMS. These topics are addressed below.

- ***Four-Month Contract Extension.*** The 18-month development period bid by Consultec, Inc. began in August 1986. Although the RFP provided the option to design the EMS using VSAM files or IMS (a DBMS which uses VSAM files as its underlying file structure), Consultec proposed the use of VSAM files. After contract negotiations, but prior to obtaining Federal approval of the contract, both the Federal government and the Connecticut Department of Income Maintenance reconsidered the decision to use VSAM. The State initiated activities to ensure that requiring Consultec to use IMS rather than VSAM was legal from a contracting standpoint.[9]

  In April 1986 the Department asked Consultec to analyze the impact of modifying the contract to replace VSAM with IMS. Consultec responded by stating that "they (Consultec) would be willing to utilize IMS...(and) requested no additional funding and asked that four months be added to the development time frame."[10]

[9] Letter, 7/9/86.

[10] Letter, 7/9/86.

On September 10, 1987 the State and Consultec agreed to the extension, at no additional cost, extending the 18 month development phase to 22 months. The System Development Milestone, previously scheduled for completion on January 28, 1988, was slipped to May 31, 1988. Statewide implementation was slipped to December 28, 1988.

In late 1987, Consultec requested an additional $2.9 million to complete EMS.[11] Connecticut's reply to Consultec for the additional funding stated that "in the event that Federal Financial Participation at the enhanced level and State funds are available, the Department (of Income Maintenance) would look favorably upon paying Consultec an additional $1,856,466 for the completion of Phase 3, System Development."[12]

The request for additional funding was made to DHHS on December 10, 1987. Connecticut defended the additional Consultec funding citing the following factors:

- DHHS strongly recommended the use of IMS *after* the Consultec contract was negotiated. It was only after the internal design was completed that the impact of that decision was fully realized.[13]

- Federal program changes, many of which were mandated, were included in the EMS design *after* the Consultec contract was executed. The practical impact of these changes on the system development schedule could not be assessed until after the requirements analysis and detailed design phase were completed.

The funding request for completing Phase 3, System Development included $1,856,466 for Consultec support and $758,464 for State personnel for the four-month extension. On May 24, 1988, the Family Support Administration (FSA) and HCFA approved the four-month extension and the funding profile exhibited in Table 7.3, Additional Consultec Funding by DHHS.

[11] Letter, 12/10/87.

[12] Letter, 12/7/87.

[13] Consultec had proposed to use 37 percent of the design supporting New Mexico's system. The decision to use IMS eliminated the possibility of even using the 37 percent.

Table 7.3 Additional Consultec Funding by DHHS

AGENCY (PROGRAM)	SHARE	90% FFP	50% FFP	TOTAL FFP
FSA (Title IV-A)	$686,892[14]	0	$343,446[15]	$343,446
HCFA (Title XIX)	$561,581	$505,423	0	$505,423
TOTAL	$1,248,473	$505,423	$343,446	$848,869

HCFA deferred reimbursement for contractor costs, $505,423, until EMS passed certification. FNS, on the other hand, withheld approval of the extension and its share of the additional Consultec costs of $364,053, until a final budget for the EMS project was submitted. This final budget would include the $1.8 million for Consultec, $758,464 in State costs, and any additional increases. On June 3, 1990, FNS capped Consultec's contract at $10,753,048. On April 20, 1990, FNS approved the final budget for EMS of $26,065,218, which included the specific increases requested by FNS.

- ***Contract Change Orders.*** The Consultec contract stipulated that the Department could, at any time and with written notice to the Contractor, make changes to the EMS which were outside the scope of the RFP. Per the contract, Consultec would be reimbursed $50 per hour to incorporate these changes into the software. In May 1988 Connecticut officially requested that Consultec make changes to EMS to support the following:

  - McKinney Homeless Act
  - Grandfathered Need Levels
  - Addition of IV-D Elements
  - IEVS Conversion
  - MMIS Eligibility History Conversion

  The cost for incorporating these changes was $146,100. By November 1989, change orders worth $947,000 had been issued to Consultec by Connecticut. An additional $1 million was requested for Consultec in the final budget to accommodate change orders beyond statewide implementation. Since May 1988, contract change orders have totalled $3,532,115.

7.1.2.3 Technical Services Contractors

Two independent contractors provided technical support to the EMS development effort:

[14] This represents 37% rather than the 37.35% share allocated per the approved CAP.

[15] Of the $686,892 approved, $280,632, $140,316 at 50 percent FFP, was allotted for State personnel costs.

- ***Thomas DiMartino*** provided comprehensive technical support to the EMS project through June 1989. This support included planning and budgeting early on in the project. The cost of Mr. DiMartino's services totalled $452,000.

- ***Kerry Sabella*** was the data base administration consultant who provided critical expertise in IMS. His services were provided from November 1986 through December 1988 at a cost of $117,000.

7.1.2.4 State Personnel

State personnel costs exceeded $4.3 million through statewide implementation. In March 1988, State personnel participation costs were estimated at $3.16 million. The increase was attributed primarily to two factors:

- The additional 12 months added to the schedule for development, testing, and implementation; and

- The increase in the number of State data processing personnel to assist in contractor oversight activities.

Table 7.1 provides a breakout of State personnel costs by type of service provided to the project.

7.2 EMS Operating Costs

Table 7.4, EMS Operating Costs, provides the costs incurred for EMS operations since FFY 1990, the share of those costs allocated to FNS (both dollar and percentage), and the operational costs allocated to FNS via the SF-269. Since EMS did not become operational statewide until the end of first quarter FFY 1990, the $10 million in EMS operating costs represented a partial year cost. EMS operating costs for FFY 1991 through third quarter FFY 1993 present the true costs of operating the EMS without distortions for development and conversion activities or operating costs associated with the CLEM system.

Table 7.4 also shows that, while EMS costs account for a significant percentage of operating costs, there are other operating costs included in the charge. These charges include operations for part of the predecessor system, which currently maintains historical caseload information, and other minor data processing charges. The table also shows that EMS operating costs declined almost 15 percent from 1991 to 1992, and, based on the costs of the three quarters in FFY 1993, can be expected to decline another 10 percent from 1992 to 1993.

Table 7.4 EMS Operating Costs

FEDERAL FISCAL YEAR	TOTAL EMS OPERATING COSTS	FNS SHARE OF EMS OPERATING COSTS		SF-269 ADP OPERATING COSTS	
		$	%	$	EMS %
1990[16]	$10,273,613	$2,014,655	19.61%	$1,867,711	00.00%
1991	$16,841,432	$3,968,382	23.56%	$4,002,454	99.15%
1992	$14,397,531	$3,902,145	27.10%	$3,922,198	99.49%
1993 (3 quarters)	$ 9,759,731	$3,259,675	33.40%	$3,272,154	99.62%

7.2.1 Cost Per Case

Based on 1992 FSP operating costs of $3,902,145,monthly operating costs averaged $325,178 in 1992. The average monthly number of FSP cases was 85,253 households. The cost per case -- the monthly operational costs divided by the number of monthly cases -- was $3.81.

7.2.2 EMS Operational Cost Control Measures and Practices

The State Data Center accumulates the units of processing resources used by EMS each month using a job accounting system. These resources are then costed using rates established by the State Data Center and approved by DIM. The total charges for EMS are presented on a monthly statement. The statement detail does not identify processing charges associated with a specific EMS module processed as part of EMS.

DIM does not split out individual cost items listed on the bill by program or programs supported. The bill specifies the totals accumulated for the following services: batch, time sharing, on-line, print, storage, direct. DIM divides the total charges for EMS among the Federal programs supported by EMS based on duplicated cases eligible for each program count as designated on the monthly EMS Assistance Unit Report.

7.3 Connecticut Cost Allocation Methodologies

This section addresses the methodology used to determine the share of EMS development costs that were allocated to each income maintenance program supported by EMS. It also describes the methodology currently used to allocate EMS operating costs to the Food Stamp Program.

[16] The percentage calculation for FFY 1990 would be inaccurate since EMS development, conversion, and implementation activities occurred in the first quarter.

7.3.1 Historical Overview of EMS Development Cost Allocation Methodology

Development costs were allocated to each program in a direct charge proportion. For the Food Stamp Program, the direct charge proportion was calculated as the time/effort devoted to system functions that support only food stamps divided by the total/time effort devoted to all system functions that support only a single program.

The process which preceded the share calculation however consisted of numerous steps:

- All functions supported by EMS were identified and grouped by category. More than 70 functions were identified and assigned to one of seven categories.
- Each EMS function was evaluated to determine whether it supported one program or many programs.[17]
- Each category was assigned a percentage factor related to the relative size of that category within EMS when all categories were taken into account.[18]
- Each function within each category was then assigned a percentage factor related to its relative resource requirements within that category.[19]
- The relative weight for each function was then calculated based on the percentage of resources required by its category times the percentage of the category allocated to that function.[20]
- The weights for all functions found to support only one function were totalled for each program and for all programs. These totals were then plugged into the program share algorithm addressed above.

The results of the weighting process indicated that 53.55 percent of the relative EMS development time/effort could be assigned to a single program; the balance, 46.45

---

[17] The results of this function identification step are documented in the EMS APD, May 1985, in the Allocation of EMS Functions table, p. 8-28+.

[18] This exercise determined that the resources required to develop all functionality within the Intake category amounted to 15 percent of total resources required; for Eligibility Determination, 25 percent; for Case Maintenance, 20 percent, etc.

[19] The Screening category was comprised of three functions assigned the following percentages: name search, 20 percent; on-line data entry/edit, 50 percent; application registration, 30 percent.

[20] Category Eligibility Determination was evaluated to require 25 percent of the time/effort resources of the EMS. The Medically Needy ED function within that category comprised 15 percent of that category. Therefore, the weight assigned the Medically Needy ED was 3.75 percent calculated as category percentage time the function percentage, or 25 percent times 15 percent.

percent, was determined to benefit all programs. The 46.45 percent all program share was allocated to each single program in the same proportion that each single program bears to the total direct charge share. The resulting distribution by program was:

- AFDC, 37.35 percent
- Medicaid, 30.25 percent
- Food Stamp, 19.61 percent
- Refugee Assistance, 2.61 percent
- State, 10.18 percent

These allocations were consistently applied throughout the EMS project.

7.3.2 EMS Operational Cost Allocation Methodology and Mechanics

Costs allocated to the Food Stamp Program via the SF-269 fall into three general categories:

- Salaries of personnel in the Department and State offices including the State Data Center
- Vendor bills including those submitted by the State Data Center for EMS operational costs
- Supplies and office space provided to DIM and supporting State agencies

DIM records these costs through a payment mechanism established by the State Comptroller, whereby batch lists of vendor bills or other documents are prepared by DIM and forwarded for processing and payment by the State Comptroller. DIM assigns a batch list number to each list, as well as a function/activity code which describes the organizational unit of DIM to which the expense applies and a major/minor object code which describes the type of expenditure.

Employee salaries are recorded in a similar manner; however, the payroll is generated through on-line input by the Payroll Unit into the Comptroller's MSA system. Expenditure certificates produced by the system are supported by an alphabetical payroll warrant listing.

DIM's ledgers are reconciled monthly to statements provided by the State Comptroller. The date on which the expenditure is recorded by the Comptroller establishes the payment date of the administrative expense for cost allocation purposes. Statements are then produced quarterly showing monthly administrative expenditures by function/activity and major/minor object. These statements *are the* basis for preparing the cost tables which support DIM's quarterly expenditure reports. These cost tables are maintained using a spreadsheet application. Employee counts

used in the allocation tables are derived from a representative staff report counting the number of persons by function/activity at the end of a month within that quarter and entered into the spreadsheet for the subsequent allocation to Federal income maintenance programs.

Table 7.5, Direct Cost Pools, lists the pools and the costs accumulated in those pools that are charged 100 percent to the Food Stamp Program. Table A-7.2 in Appendix A, Allocated Cost Pools, lists the pools whose accumulated value will be allocated among numerous income maintenance programs, the costs accumulated into each pool, and the basis for the actual allocation.

Table 7.5. Direct Cost Pools

COST POOL	COST ITEMS
EMS Development/User Support*	Salaries of staff responsible for development and user support of the integrated, automated EMS.
Food Stamp Administration	Salaries of staff assigned the responsibility for the operation of the Food Stamp Program including development of regulations and policy, provision of Food Stamp information, and general program administration.
Travel Cost	Cost of transportation, meals, lodging and related expenses of staff while on authorized travel related to the Food Stamp Program.
Bank Fees - Issuance of Food Stamps	Fees which the Department pays to participating banks for the issuance of food stamp coupons.
Data Processing Rentals	Rental costs associated with data processing equipment which supports the Food Stamp Program only.
Data Processing Services - EMS Development	Direct bills from the State Data Center which can be tied directly to development of food stamps functionality.
Food Stamps - Other Expense	Banks fees, travel, office supplies, and other miscellaneous items of expense directly related to the Food Stamp Program.
Other Current Expenses	Central office costs that can be directly related to the Food Stamp Program.

*Further allocation is on the basis set forth in the approved APD and subsequent approved revisions.

Table of Contents

APPENDIX A

STATE OF CONNECTICUT

EXHIBITS

Exhibit A-2.1
Response to Regulatory Changes

Code	Regulation	Provision	Federally Required Implementation Date	Implemented on Time (Y/N)?	Computer Programming Changes Required (Y/N)?	Changes to State Policy/ Legislation Required (Y/N)?
1.1	1: Mickey Leland Memorial Domestic Hunger Relief Act	1: Excludes as income State or local GA payments to HHS provided as vendor payments. 273.9(c)(1)(ii)(F)	8/1/91	N/A	N/A	N/A
1.2	1: Mickey Leland Memorial Domestic Hunger Relief Act	2: Excludes from income annual school clothing allowance however paid. 273.9(c)(5)(i)(F)	8/1/91	N/A	N/A	N/A
1.3	1: Mickey Leland Memorial Domestic Hunger Relief Act	3: Excludes as resource for Food Stamp purposes, household resources exempt by Public Assistance (PA) and SSI in mixed household. 273.8(e)(17)	10/1/91	N	Y	Y
1.4	1: Mickey Leland Memorial Domestic Hunger Relief Act	4: State agency shall use a standard estimate of shelter expense for households with homeless members. 273.9(d)(5)(i)	12/4/91	N	Y	Y
2.1	2: Administrative Improvement & Simplification Provisions of the Hunger Prevention Act	1: Extended resource exclusion of farm property and vehicles. 273.8(e)(5),etc.	7/1/89	Y	Y	Y
2.2	2: Administrative Improvement & Simplification Provisions of the Hunger Prevention Act	2: Combined initial allotment under normal time frames. 274.2(b)(2)	1/1/90	Y	N	N

Table of Contents

Exhibit A-2.1
Response to Regulatory Changes

Code	Regulation	Provision	Federally	Implemented	Computer	Changes to State

Exhibit A-6.1
State of Connecticut
Hardware Inventory

Component	Make	Acquisition Method	Number/ Features
CPU			
3090-300J	IBM	Purchase	64 channels, 256 MB main storage, 256 MB expanded storage, 65 MIPS
3090-600S	IBM	Purchase	64 channels, 256 MB main storage, 256 MB expanded storage, 105 MIPS
DISK			
3380/3390	IBM	Purchase	Controllers - 4 Drives - 3380 (24), 3390 (8)
Disk Array	EMC	Purchase	1 - 90 gigabytes
TAPE			
Reel Tape Drives	STK	Purchase	4670 (6)
Cartridge Drives	IBM	Purchase	3480 (22)
PRINTERS			
CATER Impact Laser	 STK IBM	 Purchase Purchase	 5000 (1) 3800 (1)
DSS Impact Laser	 NTC Xerox	 Purchase Purchase	 BP2000 (2) 9790 (2)
FRONT ENDS			
FEPs	IBM	Purchase	3745 (4)
REMOTE EQUIPMENT			
Workstations	IBM	Purchase	3270 (1641)

Exhibit A-7.1 EMS APD History

		APD DATES			FNS APPROVAL		
APD DATE REVISION #	TOTAL BUDGET $	CONTRACTOR START	S/W IMPLEMENT	APD FNS SHARE	DATE	SHARE	COMMENTS
5/20/85	$7,444,742	3/15/86	6/15/87	$985,498	-	-	Specific approval documentation not reviewed.
8/20/85 #1	"	"	"	$1,459,922	-	-	
9/16/85 #2	"	8/1/86	5/31/88	$1,052,684	10/16/85	$1,290,892	Approved development costs of $6,582,826, a FNS share of 19.61%; a 75% FFP for $968,169.
3/27/86 #3	$12,952,820	6/1/86	11/30/87	$2,540,051			Specific approval documentation not reviewed.
6/24/86 #4	$13,343,637	8/1/86	5/31/88	$2,616,691	7/16/86	$2,388,400	Approved maximum development cost of $13,343,637; enhanced funding at 75%, or $1,791,300.
6/15/87 #5	"	8/28/86	6/28/88	"	"	"	Per 1/26/88 letter in regard to a 12/16/87 meeting in Washington, DC: approval contingent on a final budget that included an additional $1.8 million for the four-month contract extension requested by Consultec, $1 million in site prep costs, and $758,464 in additional State personnel costs.
3/25/882 #6	$18,037,975	"	10/28/88	$3,537,250	"	"	Per June 3, 1988 letter: "...capped Consultec's contract at $10,353,248 and stipulated that no payment would be made to Consultec for the Phase 3 deliverable until full statewide implementation had been successfully completed...", as referenced in 4/26/90 letter addressing final APD.
3/15/89 #7	$27,181,079	"	11/1/89	$4,444,927	"	"	Specific approval documentation not reviewed.
11/1/89 #8	$26,065,218	"	3/1/90	$5,111,389	4/20/90	$5,111,389	Per 4/26/90 letter: Conditional approval of total project cost of $26,065,218; $5,111,389 share; FFP $3,235,055.
4/27/90	"	"	"	"	"	"	Final update to ADP for the design, development and implementation of EMS (per 4/27/90 cover letter)

Exhibit A-7.2 Cost Allocation Pools

COST POOL	COST ITEMS	ALLOCATIONMETHODOLOGY
Case Management & Intake Salaries	Salaries of Department staff at the district office level involved with eligibility determination, case management or interim activity.	Random Moment Sampling
District Office Administration Salaries	Salaries of Department staff at the district office whose assigned duties are the administration of all agency programs including: District Directors, Program Supervisors, and clerical support staff who administer the Food Stamps Program.	Ratio of total number of Case Management/Intake employees allocated to the Food Stamp Program (FSP) as a percentage of the total number of Case Management/Intake employees.
Income Maintenance Administration Salaries	Salaries of Department staff at the Central Office whose assigned duties are in direct administrative support of public assistance and medical assistance.	
Quality Control Salaries	Salaries of Department Staff responsible for conducting full field reviews to verify correct determinations of eligibility and payment amounts, or of ineligibility, for Food Stamps.	FSP's share of the total number of quality control reviews completed including both positive and negative reviews, as defined by Federal regulation.
Fair Hearings Salaries	Salaries of Fair Hearings units staff who carry out the fair hearing process for all programs administered by the Department.	FSP's share based on the most recent available quarterly summary of fair hearing dispositions. The counts of fair hearings disposed of will be updated at least annually using a complete quarterly count.
Administrative Overhead Salaries	Salaries of personnel in the following offices: Office of Commissioner; Financial Management; Management, Planning and Evaluation; Program Policy; Public Information; Staff Development; and the balance of Administrative Services, Program Integrity, and Data Processing not otherwise allocated.	Ratio of the total number of district office & admin employees charged or allocated to FSP as a percentage of the total number of district office & admin employees. (District office & admin employees include employees in Income Maintenance Admin, Quality Control, Fair Hearings, and Food Stamps Admin)
Travel Cost	Cost of transportation, meals, lodging and related expenses of Department staff while on authorized travel on state business.	Ratio of the central office + district office & admin employees less Department of Human Resources employees charged or allocated to FSP as a percentage of the total number of employees that meet these organizational criteria.
Rents, Utilities and Janitorial Services - District Office	Self-explanatory.	Ratio of the total number of Case Management and Intake employees charged or allocated to FSP as a percentage of the total number of Case Management and Intake employees.
Motor Vehicle Repairs, Supplies and Rentals	Costs related to state motor vehicles used by Department staff in the course of their duties.	Ratio of the central office + district office & admin employees less Department of Human Resources employees charged or allocated to FSP as a percentage of the total number of employees that meet these organizational criteria.
Other Current Expenses - District Office	Costs incurred in this classification include, but are not limited to: Office supplies, general repairs.	Ratio of total number of Case Management/Intake employees allocated to FSP as a percentage of the total number of Case Management/Intake employees.

Exhibit A-7.2 Cost Allocation Pools

COST POOL	COST ITEMS	ALLOCATIONMETHODOLOGY
University of Connecticut Educational Program, Department Share	Staff training and development services provided by University of Connecticut.	Training hours for a given month are directly identified to specific programs, where possible; the balance not directly identifiable to specific programs or to general topics are separately accumulated. Throughout the contract year the total cost of the University of Connecticut billing for a given month is prorated based on the distribution of hours by program and general program. A specific allocation methodology is then applied.
State Data Center Charges - Non EMS	Direct billings from the State Data Center as assigned to a Category Level: Level I: Charges that can be identified as to the specific benefitting program Level II: Charges benefitting more than one program Level III: All other data center processing costs, including jobs not yet categorized, supplies, paper, etc. Level IV: All charges related to general administrative support.	 Level I: Direct charged to benefitting program. Level II: Unduplicated case counts. Level III: Sum Level I and Level II charges for a program ÷ total Level I and Level II charges. Level IV: Same as Travel Cost.
State Data Center Charges - EMS	Reference Section 7.2.2.	Reference Section 7.2.2.
Charges from Outside Vendors	Cost of data processing services provided by outside vendors identified with a specific Level I or Level II Category, if possible, and allocated IAW the percentages applicable to the appropriate program category. The costs of outside services and equipment which are not identifiable as benefitting a specific Level I or II category will be allocated based on the Level III percentage derived for that quarter.	Non EMS - Same as methodology used for State Data Center Charges cost pool. EMS - Reference Section 7.2.2.
Mailing Costs	Postage costs, primarily for mailing recipient checks and authorizations to participate cards, but also for all other Department business.	Total percentage by program derived from the logs on which daily piece counts are recorded by program by the central office Duplicating Unit.
Other Current Expenses	Central office costs including, but not limited to: Hearing officers, office supplies, machine rentals, general repairs,etc.	Ratio of the total number of department employees (excluding Department of Human Resources) charged or allocated to FSP as a percentage of the total number of department employees (excluding Department of Human Resources).
Employee Fringe Benefits	State's employer costs of FICA, group life and health insurance, retirement and related items which are reflected in the fringe benefit rate approved by DHHS Division of Cost Allocation.	Calculated using the approved percentage of the covered Department payroll as set forth in the approved Statewide Cost Allocation Plan, applied to the cost of total salaries on Line A-22.
2Statewide Cost Allocation (SWCAP)	Costs for central agency services furnished, but not billed, to the Department. Costs included in this pool are detailed in the state's negotiated agreement with the Department of Health and Human Services each year.	Ratio of the total number of department employees charged or allocated to FSP as a percentage of the total number of department employees.

Table of Contents

APPENDIX B

STATE OF CONNECTICUT

ANALYSIS OF OPERATOR USER SATISFACTION SURVEYS

OVERVIEW

This appendix presents the results of the Operational Level User Satisfaction Survey. Frequency counts of responses to all applicable items on the survey are included, grouped by the topic covered by the item. The results for the items covering each topic are summarized as well.

The responses to the Operational Level User Satisfaction Survey are the perceptions of eligibility workers in Connecticut. In other words, these responses do not necessarily represent a "true" description of the situation in Connecticut. For example, the results presented regarding the response time of the system reflect the workers' perceptions about that response time, not an objective measure of the actual speed of the response.

Description of the Sample

The following table summarizes the potential population size and the final size of the sample who responded.

Number of EWs in Connecticut	Number Selected to Receive Survey	Percentage Selected
682	63	9.2%
	Number Responding to Survey	Response Rate
	34	53.9%

The eligibility workers selected to receive the survey were selected randomly so their perceptions should be representative of eligibility workers in Connecticut. The response rate of 54 percent is acceptable, producing a sample whose responses should be representative of eligibility workers in Connecticut.

Summary of Findings

Most of the respondents are satisfied with the computer system in Connecticut. They generally find it responsive, accurate, and fairly easy to use. Two complaints are that response time is sometimes too slow during peak periods and that the system is down too often.

Most respondents also think the computer system helps them do their jobs and makes them more efficient, although 44 percent feel the system adds stress to their jobs.

SYSTEM CHARACTERISTICS

Response Time

What is the quality of overall system response time?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents(%)
Poor	2	5.9
Good	28	82.4
Excellent	4	11.8

What is the quality of system response time during peak periods?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents(%)
Poor	12	35.3
Good	22	64.7

How often is the system response time too slow?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents(%)
Rarely	10	29.4
Sometimes	20	58.8
Often	4	11.8

The eligibility workers who responded almost all agree that the system's response time is generally good or excellent but a majority (71 percent) agree that response time is sometimes or often poor.

Availability

How often is the system available when you need to use it?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Sometimes	3	8.8
Often	31	91.2

How often is the system down?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	23	67.6
Sometimes	10	29.4
Often	1	2.9

A large majority (91 percent) of the eligibility workers who responded think the system is generally available while a smaller majority agrees that it is rarely down.

Accuracy

What is the quality of the information in the system?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Poor	2	6.1
Good	26	78.8
Excellent	5	15.2

How often is a case terminated in error?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents(%)
Rarely	22	64.7
Sometimes	9	26.5
Often	3	8.8

How often is eligibility incorrectly determined?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents(%)
Rarely	21	63.6
Sometimes	9	27.3
Often	3	9.1

How often is the systems data out-of-date?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents(%)
Rarely	24	72.7
Sometimes	8	24.2
Often	1	3.0

Under the new (current) system, how difficult or easy is it to calculate benefit levels accurately?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents(%)
More Difficult	4	13.8
About the same	5	17.2
Easier	20	69.0

The eligibility workers who responded consistently feel that the

operations of the system are accurate. A large majority (94 percent) of them think the information in the system is either good or excellent.

Ease of Use

How often do you have difficulty obtaining necessary information from the system?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	21	65.6
Sometimes	9	28.1
Often	2	6.3

How often do you have difficulty learning to use the system?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	23	71.9
Sometimes	5	15.6
Often	4	12.5

How often do you have difficulty tracking receipt of monthly reporting forms?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	21	72.4
Sometimes	8	27.6

How often do you have difficulty automatically terminating benefits for failure to file?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	27	84.4
Sometimes	5	15.6

How often do you have difficulty generating adverse action notices?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	24	77.4
Sometimes	5	16.1
Often	2	6.5

How often do you have difficulty generating warning notices?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	24	77.4
Sometimes	5	16.1
Often	2	6.5

How often do you have difficulty determining monthly reporting status?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	24	75.0
Sometimes	8	25.0

How often do you have difficulty restoring benefits?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	19	59.4
Sometimes	9	28.1
Often	4	12.5

How often do you have difficulty identifying recipients already known to the State?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	24	75.0
Sometimes	6	18.8
Often	2	6.3

How often do you have difficulty updating registration data?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	25	89.3
Sometimes	3	10.7

How often do you have difficulty updating eligibility and benefit information from recertification data?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	27	84.4
Sometimes	5	15.6

How often do you have difficulty identifying cases which are overdue for recertification?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents(%)
Rarely	21	67.7
Sometimes	7	22.6
Often	3	9.7

How often do you have difficulty monitoring the status of all hearings?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents(%)
Rarely	13	52.0
Sometimes	5	20.0
Often	7	28.0

How often do you have difficulty tracking outstanding verifications?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents(%)
Rarely	16	55.2
Sometimes	10	34.5
Often	3	10.3

How often do you have difficulty automatically notifying households of case actions?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents(%)
Rarely	24	75.0
Sometimes	8	25.0

How often do you have difficulty notifying recipients that recertification is required?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents(%)
Rarely	24	77.4
Sometimes	5	16.1
Often	2	6.5

How often do you have difficulty identifying cases making payments through recoupment?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents(%)
Rarely	18	60.0
Sometimes	7	23.3
Often	5	16.7

How often do you have difficulty identifying error prone cases?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents(%)
Rarely	15	53.6
Sometimes	7	25.0
Often	6	21.4

How often do you have difficulty identifying cases involving suspected fraud?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents(%)
Rarely	13	46.4
Sometimes	10	35.7
Often	5	17.9

How often do you have difficulty assigning new case numbers?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents(%)
Rarely	25	83.3
Sometimes	4	13.3
Often	1	3.3

Under the new (current) system, how difficult or easy is it to determine eligibility?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents(%)
More Difficult	3	10.0
About the same	9	30.0
Easier	18	60.0

Under the new (current) system, how difficult or easy is it to track receipt of monthly reporting forms?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents(%)
About the same	15	53.6
Easier	13	46.4

Under the new (current) system, how difficult or easy is it to automatically terminate benefits for failure to file?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents(%)
More Difficult	1	3.4
About the same	5	17.2
Easier	23	79.3

Under the new (current) system, how difficult or easy is it to generate warning notices?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents(%)
More Difficult	1	3.6
About the same	5	17.9
Easier	22	78.6

Under the new (current) system, how difficult or easy is it to determine monthly reporting status?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents(%)
More Difficult	1	3.4
About the same	11	37.9
Easier	17	58.6

Under the new (current) system, how difficult or easy is it to restore benefits?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
More Difficult	2	6.9
About the same	5	17.2
Easier	22	75.9

Most of the eligibility workers responding do not have difficulty performing any of the system-specific tasks such as assigning new case numbers or generating adverse action notices. One exception is monitoring the status of hearings, almost 50 percent of the eligibility workers experience some difficulty with this task. The eligibility workers generally perceive the new system as easier to use.

FOOD STAMP PROGRAM NEEDS

Worker Satisfaction Levels

How often is the system a great help to you in your job?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Sometimes	9	26.5
Often	25	73.5

How often is the system an added stress in your job?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	11	32.4
Sometimes	17	50.0
Often	6	17.6

How often is the system more of a problem than a help?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents(%)
Rarely	24	75.0
Sometimes	7	21.8
Often	1	3.1

Under the new (current) system, how satisfying do you find your work now?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents(%)
Less	7	22.6
About the same	13	41.9
More	11	35.5

Under the new (current) system, how pleasant do you find your work now?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents(%)
Less	8	26.7
About the same	13	43.3
More	9	30.0

Under the new (current) system, how stressful do you find your work now?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents(%)
Less	6	20.0
About the same	12	40.0
More	12	40.0

Under the new (current) system, how much are you able to get done now?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents(%)
Less	1	3.3
About the same	4	13.3
More	25	83.3

Under the new (current) system, how efficient are you in your work now?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents(%)
Less	2	6.7
About the same	12	40.0
More	16	53.3

How do you rate the new (current) system in comparison to the previous system?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Worse	1	3.4
About the same	4	13.8
Better	24	82.8

Most of the eligibility workers who responded think that the current system is a great help to them in their work and 83 percent feel that it is better than the previous system.

Client Service

How often is expedited service difficult to achieve?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	23	71.8
Sometimes	7	21.8
Often	2	6.3

How often do you have difficulty providing expedited services?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
Rarely	23	74.2
Sometimes	7	22.6
Often	1	3.2

Under the new (current) system, how difficult or easy is it to interview a client in a timely manner?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
More Difficult	1	3.3
About the same	14	46.7
Easier	15	50.0

Under the new (current) system, how would you rate the number of trips the client has to make to obtain benefits?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
About the same	22	75.9
Fewer	7	24.1

Under the new (current) system, how would you rate the amount of time a client has to wait in the office?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
More	3	10.3
About the same	19	65.5
Less	7	24.1

Under the new (current) system, how would you rate the amount of paperwork demanded of the client?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents (%)
More	3	10.3
About the same	16	55.2
Less	10	34.5

Over 70 percent of the eligibility workers who responded agree that expedited service is rarely difficult to provide. Providing other client services usually requires about the same level of effort or is easier with the new system.

Fraud and Errors

Under the new (current) system, how difficult or easy is it to collect overpayments?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents(%)
More Difficult	4	14.8
About the same	11	40.7
Easier	12	44.4

Under the new (current) system, how many errors are made?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents(%)
More	3	11.1
About the same	9	33.3
Fewer	15	55.6

Under the new (current) system, how many instances of fraud get by?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents(%)
More	2	7.4
About the same	10	37.0
Fewer	15	55.6

On average, the eligibility workers, feel that fraud and errors have decreased with the new system. About one third feel that the instances of fraud and error are about the same.

Table of Contents

APPENDIX C

STATE OF CONNECTICUT

ANALYSIS OF MANAGERIAL USER SATISFACTION SURVEYS

OVERVIEW

This appendix presents the results of the Managerial Level User Satisfaction Survey. Frequency counts of responses to all items on the survey are included, grouped by the topic covered by the item. The results for the items covering each topic are summarized as well.

The responses to the Managerial Level User Satisfaction Survey are the perceptions of supervisors in Connecticut. In other words, these responses do not necessarily represent a "true" description of the situation in Connecticut. For example, the results presented regarding the response time of the system reflect the managers' perceptions about that response time, not an objective measure of the actual speed of the response.

Description of the Sample

The following table summarizes the potential population size and the final size of the sample who responded.

Number of Supervisors in Connecticut	Number Selected to Receive Survey	Percentage Selected
103	30	29.1%
	Number Responding to Survey	Response Rate
	17	56.6%

The supervisors selected to receive the survey were selected randomly so their perceptions should be representative of the population of supervisors in Connecticut. The response rate of 57 percent is moderately low, producing a sample whose responses may not be representative of the eligibility worker supervisors in Connecticut.

Summary of Findings

Most of the supervisors think the system is very good and easy to

SYSTEM CHARACTERISTICS

Response Time

What is the quality of overall system response time?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Poor	1	5.9
Good	13	76.5
Excellent	3	17.6

What is the quality of system response time during peak periods?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Poor	3	17.6
Good	12	70.6
Excellent	2	11.8

The supervisors who responded almost all agree that the system's response time is generally good or excellent at all times.

Availability

How often is the system down?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Rarely	10	58.8
Sometimes	7	41.2

A majority of the supervisors who responded feel that the system is rarely down.

Accuracy

What is the quality of the information in the system?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Poor	1	5.9
Good	12	70.6
Excellent	4	23.5

Under the new (current) system, how difficult or easy is it to calculate benefit levels accurately?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
More Difficult	2	12.5
About the same	3	18.8
Easier	11	68.8

The supervisors who responded almost all find the information and algorithms of the system to be accurate and easy to use.

Ease of Use

How often do you have difficulty obtaining necessary information from the system?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Rarely	11	64.7
Sometimes	6	35.3

How often do you have difficulty learning to use the system?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Rarely	13	86.7
Sometimes	1	6.7
Often	1	6.7

How often do you have difficulty tracking receipt of monthly reporting forms?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Rarely	12	92.3
Sometimes	1	7.7

How often do you have difficulty automatically terminating benefits for failure to file?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Rarely	14	93.3
Sometimes	1	6.7

How often do you have difficulty generating adverse action notices?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Rarely	15	100.0

How often do you have difficulty generating warning notices?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Rarely	13	86.7
Sometimes	2	13.3

How often do you have difficulty determining monthly reporting status?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Rarely	13	81.3
Sometimes	3	18.8

How often do you have difficulty restoring benefits?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Rarely	8	47.1
Sometimes	9	52.9

Under the new (current) system, how difficult or easy is it to determine eligibility?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
More Difficult	2	12.5
About the same	4	25.0
Easier	10	62.5

Under the new (current) system, how difficult or easy is it to track receipt of monthly reporting forms?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
About the same	6	46.2
Easier	7	53.8

Under the new (current) system, how difficult or easy is it to automatically terminate benefits for failure to file?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
About the same	2	14.3
Easier	12	85.7

Under the new (current) system, how difficult or easy is it to generate warning notices?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
About the same	2	13.3
Easier	13	86.7

Under the new (current) system, how difficult or easy is it to determine monthly reporting status?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
About the same	5	35.7
Easier	9	64.3

Under the new (current) system, how difficult or easy is it to restore benefits?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
More Difficult	1	6.3
About the same	5	31.3
Easier	10	62.5

Most of the supervisors responding have no difficulty obtaining information or learning the system. Very few experience any difficulty performing such tasks as automatically terminating benefits for failure to file or generating adverse action notices. A majority, however, report difficulty in restoring benefits. Almost all agreed that these system-related tasks are easier under the new system than under the former system.

FOOD STAMP PROGRAM NEEDS

Supervisor Satisfaction Levels

How often is the system a great help to you in your job?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Rarely	1	5.9
Sometimes	3	17.6
Often	13	76.5

How often is the system an added stress in your job?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Rarely	5	29.4
Sometimes	10	58.8
Often	2	11.8

Under the new (current) system, how satisfying do you find your work?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Less	1	6.3
About the same	9	56.3
More	6	37.5

Under the new (current) system, how pleasant do you find your work?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
About the same	10	62.5
More	6	37.5

Under the new (current) system, how stressful do you find your work?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Less	3	18.8
About the same	7	43.8
More	6	37.5

Under the new (current) system, how much work are you able to get done?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Less	1	6.3
About the same	7	43.8
More	8	50.0

Under the new (current) system, how efficient are you in your work?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
About the same	7	43.8
More	9	56.3

How do you rate the new (current) system in comparison to the previous system?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
About the same	5	31.3
Better	11	68.8

More than three quarters of the supervisors who responded think that the current system is a great help to them in their work but a majority (71 percent) also felt that it sometimes or often contributes added stress. Generally the supervisors regard the current system as an improvement that increases efficiency and productivity.

Management Needs

What is the quality of the reports produced by the system?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Poor	6	37.5
Good	10	62.5

What is the quality of the support provided by the technical staff supporting the automated system?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Poor	2	11.8
Good	11	64.7
Excellent	4	23.5

How often do you have difficulty making mass changes to the system?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Rarely	6	85.7
Sometimes	1	14.3

How often do you have difficulty meeting Federal reporting requirements?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Rarely	7	63.6
Sometimes	4	36.4

Under the new (current) system, how efficient are the people you supervise?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Less	2	12.5
About the same	8	50.0
More	6	37.5

Under the new (current) system, how difficult or easy is it to make mass changes?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
More Difficult	1	20.0
Easier	4	80.0

Under the new (current) system, how difficult or easy is it to evaluate local office efficiency?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
About the same	8	80.0
Easier	2	20.0

Most of the supervisors responding think the system helps them in their management tasks, although 36 percent reported difficulty in meeting Federal reporting requirements. Most (88 percent) think the support provided by the technical staff is good or excellent.

Client Service

Under the new (current) system, how difficult or easy is it to interview a client in a timely manner?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
More Difficult	1	6.7
About the same	8	53.3
Easier	6	40.0

Under the new (current) system, how would you rate the services received by the client?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
About the same	7	46.7
Better	8	53.3

Under the new (current) system, how do you think the average client is being served?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
About the same	7	43.8
Better	9	56.3

About half the supervisors responding felt that client service under the current system was about the same as under the previous system. The other half felt that client service had improved.

Fraud and Errors

Under the new (current) system, how difficult or easy is it to collect overpayments?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
More Difficult	1	6.7
About the same	3	20.0
Easier	11	73.3

Under the new (current) system, how many errors are made?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
More	4	25.0
About the same	9	56.3
Less	3	18.8

Under the new (current) system, how many false claims are caught?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Fewer	1	6.3
About the same	10	62.5
More	5	31.3

Under the new (current) system, how many instances of fraud get by?

	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
More	2	12.5
About the same	11	68.8
Fewer	3	18.8

Most of the eligibility worker supervisors feel that the new system has little impact on the detection of fraud and errors. A significant majority believe, however, that it is easier to collect overpayments under the new system.